

(3) O.N. Pugachev

Parasitic Worms Department, Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Universitetskaya nab. 1, St Petersburg 199034, Russia

With reference to Dr Baturo's application to the Commission regarding *Bucephalus polymorphus*, I should like to support her proposal and to draw your attention to similar problems which can arise when the Code is applied rigidly in relation to parasitic worms with complex life-cycles. The Code was developed essentially for free-living organisms, where the number of conflicting cases based upon names derived from different life-history stages are few in relation to those of parasitic organisms. In view of this, there should be some flexibility in the application of the Code and, perhaps, future additions to the Code. In this particular instance, if the Code is applied rigidly, then much confusion could result.

(4) J.C. Pearson

Department of Parasitology, University of Queensland, Queensland 4072, Australia

I support whole-heartedly Dr Baturo's application to the Commission on *Bucephalus* and the combination *Bucephalus polymorphus*.

Report on the proposed suppression of the generic name *Belemnites* Lamarck, 1799 (Mollusca, Coleoidea), with a proposal that the family-group name BELEMNITIDAE Owen, 1838 be ruled unavailable and be replaced by PASSALOTEUTHIDIDAE Naef, 1922 (Case 2571; see BZN 43: 355–359; 44: 48, 194; 45: 50; 46: 267–272)

P.K. Tubbs

Executive Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

The previous history of this case was summarized in BZN 46: 267–269. The application by Drs P. Doyle and W. Riegraf proposed the suppression of the generic name *Belemnites* Lamarck, 1799 and the specific name of the (indeterminate) type species *B. paxillosa* Lamarck, 1801. In contrast to the vernacular collective name 'belemnites', *Belemnites* has for many years been essentially unused as a generic name although the family name BELEMNITIDAE has remained in common use. BELEMNITIDAE, in recent times treated as though typified by the nominal genus *Passaloteuthis* Lissajous, 1915 (p. 9), has previously been attributed to d'Orbigny (1845) but Mr D. Heppell has pointed out that it was made available by Owen (1838, p. 127). The application called for the designation of *Passaloteuthis* as the type genus of the BELEMNITIDAE by the use of the Commission's plenary powers; this was widely supported, and, as reported in BZN 46: 268, in March 1989 the Commission voted in favour by 20 votes to 3. However, in dissenting, Prof W.D.L. Ride asked that the case be resubmitted because he considered that the designation of *Passaloteuthis* as the type genus of BELEMNITIDAE would be 'seriously upsetting' by being a departure from a fundamental principle of the Code, namely Article 63 (eponymous families and type genera). Prof Ride proposed that *Belemnites bruguierianus* d'Orbigny, 1843, the type species of *Passaloteuthis*, be ruled

to be also the type species of *Belemnites* and that the latter name be then deemed a junior objective synonym of *Passaloteuthis*: thus the only function of *Belemnites* would be to stand as the formal type genus of BELEMNITIDAE. Responses to Prof Ride's proposals by eight palaeontologists were published in BZN 46: 269–272 and a ninth (by Dr T. Engeser, *Universität Hamburg, Germany*) was noted on the voting papers sent to Commissioners in September 1990; with one exception they supported the original course. In the September 1990 vote the Commission was asked either (a) again to approve the Doyle & Riegraf application or (b) to accept Prof Ride's alternative. Thirteen Commissioners voted in favour of each course, and no Opinion has been issued.

Drs Doyle and Riegraf have reiterated that any retention of *Belemnites* as a generic name, even as a synonym deemed to be junior, would be unacceptable to workers in the belemnite field. In the light of the above history they now propose that BELEMNITIDAE should be abandoned in favour of PASSALOTEUTHIDINAE Naef, 1922 (p. 230), which was treated as a superfamily by Saks & Nal'nyaeva (1967). The emended suffix -IDINAE is both correct and in accord with other family-group names based on generic names ending in *-teuthis*. Dr Doyle has pointed out that the valid specific name of *Belemnites bruguierianus* d'Orbigny, 1843, the type species of *Passaloteuthis*, is *bisulcatus* de Blainville, 1827 (p. 79).

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

- (1) to confirm the previous (March 1989) vote suppressing the generic name *Belemnites* Lamarck, 1799 and the specific name of *B. paxillosa* Lamarck, 1801;
- (2) to use its plenary powers to rule that the name BELEMNITIDAE Owen, 1838 is unavailable because the name of the type genus of the nominal family has been suppressed;
- (3) to confirm the previous (March 1989) placement of the following names:
 - (a) *Passaloteuthis* Lissajous, 1915 on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;
 - (b) *Belemnites* Lamarck, 1799 on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology;
 - (c) *paxillosa* Lamarck, 1801, as published in the binomen *Belemnites paxillosa*, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology;
- (4) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the name *bisulcatus* de Blainville, 1827, as published in the binomen *Belemnites bisulcatus* (senior subjective synonym of *Belemnites bruguierianus* d'Orbigny, 1843, the type species of *Passaloteuthis* Lissajous, 1915);
- (5) to place on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology the name PASSALOTEUTHIDINAE Naef, 1922 (type genus *Passaloteuthis* Lissajous, 1915);
- (6) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology the name BELEMNITIDAE Owen, 1838, as ruled in (2) above to be unavailable because the name of its type genus *Belemnites* Lamarck, 1799 has been suppressed.

References

- Blainville, H.M.D. de. 1827. *Mémoire sur les Bélemnites, considérées zoologiquement et géologiquement*. 136 pp., 5 pls. Paris.

- Lissajous, M. 1915. Quelques remarques sur les bélemnites Jurassiques. *Bulletin de la Société d'Histoire Naturelle de Mâcon*, 1915(1): 1–32.
- Naef, A. 1922. *Die fossilen Tintenfische*. 322 pp. Fischer, Jena.
- Owen, R. 1838. Descriptions of some new and rare Cephalopoda. *Transactions of the Zoological Society of London*, 2(2): 103–130.
- Saks, V.N. & Nal'nyaeva, T.I. 1967. Recognition of the superfamily Passaloteuthaceae in the suborder Belemnoida (Cephalopoda, Dibranchia, Decapoda). *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR*, 173: 438–441. [In Russian.]

Comments on the proposed confirmation of unavailability of the name *Fusus* Helbling, 1779 (Mollusca, Gastropoda)

(Case 2729; see BZN 48: 92–96, 244–246)

(1) Barry Roth

Research Associate, Museum of Paleontology, University of California, San Francisco, U.S.A.

I write in support of the application by Petit & Wilson regarding the availability of the putative genus-group name *Fusus* Helbling, 1779. The crucial point is made in para. 10 (BZN 48: 93): the name cannot continue to be accepted for one purpose (as a senior homonym of *Fusus* Bruguière, 1789) and rejected for another (as a senior subjective synonym of *Colubraria* Schumacher, 1817 and *Cumia* Bivona-Bernardi, 1838); such a split requires action by the Commission.

The suggestion of BZN 48: 94, para. 17, a ruling that *Fusus* Helbling is unavailable, is a reasonable solution. Partisans of the name *Fusinus* Rafinesque, 1815, which would fall as a junior objective synonym of *Fusus* Bruguière, 1789, would undoubtedly prefer another form of solution, but in any event action by the Commission is warranted.

(2) A.G. Beu

DSIR Geology and Geophysics, P.O. Box 30368, Lower Hutt, New Zealand

B.A. Marshall

National Museum of New Zealand, P.O. Box 467, Wellington, New Zealand

W.F. Ponder

Australian Museum, P.O. Box A285, Sydney South, New South Wales 2000, Australia

We should like to comment on the case of *Fusus* Helbling, 1779. We have seen the comment by Prof Emily Vokes (BZN 48: 245–246) and essentially agree with her, although we go a little further with our alternative proposals.

In our opinion the question of availability of the name *Fusus* Helbling, 1779, as presented by Petit & Wilson (BZN 48: 92–96), is largely irrelevant to the main question of nomenclatural stability inherent in their case. By far the major point of stability at issue here is that, since Dall (1906) advocated the adoption of *Fusinus* Rafinesque, 1815 in place of *Fusus* Bruguière, 1789, the usage of *Fusinus* in this sense has become the normal, thoroughly accepted practice by 100% of malacologists and palaeontologists. The genus group now universally known as *Fusinus* comprises several large,